

August 14, 1986

Hon. Matthew F. Coppolo
Justice of the Supreme Court
Westchester County,
111 Grove Street,
White Plains, New York, 10601

Honorable Sir:

1a. In very crystal clear language, in the Supreme Court, Bronx County, in open court, on the morning of August 4, 1986, it was announced by, inter alia, Donald F. Schneider, Esq., of Feltman, Karesh, Major & Farbman, Esqs., that Your Honor had been "fixed", and therefore Mr. Schneider consented to the return of the Writ to Westchester County.

b. Thereafter, about all Your Honor's actions, confirmed what Mr. Schneider had said in a "boasting manner", in Bronx County!

c. Further confirmation of such manifest impropriety, has since been received.

2a. Instructively, it was based upon a false and uncorroborated affidavit by Mr. Schneider, that Sam Polur, Esq., was incarcerated for 20 days last year, also without a trial!

b. Present at such falsely alleged incident, which was the basis of the accusation, were Michael J. Gerstein, Esq. of Kreindler & Relkin, P.C. and Senior Attorney, David S. Cook, Esq., who failed and refused to corroborate Mr. Schneider's accusation against Mr. Polur.

c. Apparently, they entertain fear in confirming Mr. Schneider's false accusation against Mr. Polur, since they are unaware of the evidence I have to prove the accusation false!

d. Indeed, once Mr. Polur was incarcerated, I do not recall Mr. Schneider ever denying the accusation to have been false, again because Mr. Schneider also does not know the evidence I have in hand to prove the accusation false, although he opposed Mr. Polur's release, and opposes Mr. Polur's attempts to vacate such judgment of conviction!

d. In short -- "fixing" is Mr. Schneider's, his firm's, and Kreindler & Relkin, P.C., modus operandi, as they throw their adversaries into jail, and then "fix" writs of habeas corpus, so that they are not released!

August 14, 1986

3a. Having practiced for thirty-seven years, and no longer believing in the existence of the "tooth fairy", I reluctantly recognize with some silence certain practices of which I, nor "the law", approve.

b. Nevertheless, "fixing" a writ of habeas corpus ad subjiciendum against a petitioner is base and vile, even according to attorneys of questionable repute, to whom I have spoken to over the past year on the subject.

4a. My principal legal concern is not avoiding any incarceration, albeit innocent and denied essentially all my constitutional rights!

b. My principal concern, is to clean out the "temples of justice" of these "criminals with law degrees" and their "hard core judicial pimps"!

c. I intend to spare no one, and nothing in achieving that goal!

d. I intend to massively inundate, each and every county in this state, and every jurist thereof, in the County Court and Supreme Court, with a successive writ of habeas corpus, as is my constitutional right, with copies to all bar associations, public interests groups, and media outlets.

e. Obviously, I will set forth, as I must, the fact that Your Honor denied such petition, without a hearing, and the facts, as I know them, for such action, with scrupulous obedience for the truth!

f. Simultaneously, appellate review will be expeditiously pursued, so that I may properly enter the federal forum for relief, while, at the same time, exposing these moral lepers!

g. In short, I intend to be "the last victim" of an incarceration without a trial, (Nye v. United States, 313 U.S. 33, 46), and the "last person" against whom any attempt will be made to illegitimately "fix" a writ o habeas corpus ad subjiciendum!

4. Towards that singular goal, demand is hereby made, pursuant to Canon 3B3 of the Code of Judicial Conduct, that Your Honor make full report of the surrounding facts to the appropriate authorities!

5a. I believe it not inappropriate to state that neither Your Honor, Associate Justice Isaac Rubin, or anyone else in this County knows or is aware of my principal argument before the Appellate Division!

b. Point I was not my constitutional rights under Amendment VI of the United States Constitution and Article 1, §6 of the New York State Constitution, but the right to free and independent judges.

c. This is an exact, in haec verba copy of my brief, on the point:

"POINT I
NO COMPROMISE
(JUDICIAL INDEPENDENCE)

1a. The robe, whether by virtue of election or appointment, is not an emolument of office, for the purpose of fixing, soliciting, or importuning judicial action, or types of action!

b. The right to judicial independence, is the litigant's constitutional right, not the private asset of the jurist involved.

c. To the extent that Mr. Justice Martin Evans, resisted improper judicial pressures, nothing should be done by this Court, even by indirection, which would erode this feat of judicial courage!

2a. The administrative judge, by virtue of his position alone, presents a unique danger that judicial independence will be compromised for administrative purposes, even where well intentioned (Balogh v. H.R.B. Caterers, 88 A.D.2d 136, 452 N.Y.S.2d 220 [2d Dept., per Titone, J.])

b. Sassower's position of 'no-compromise' on judicial non-interference, is the only position that any Court can properly and constitutionally recognize.

3a. The practice, unabashedly admitted by appellant as successful, that he importuned the Administrator to intervene with Mr. Justice Evans, should be resoundingly condemned, in no uncertain terms!

b. Throughout the Puccini litigation, and clearly from the time the 'hard evidence' surfaced concerning the larceny of its assets, 'the criminals with law degrees' have repeatedly petitioned, generally ex parte and sub rosa, the 'trio of judicial fixers' to intervene on their behalf.

August 14, 1986


c. 'Fixing', in addition to larceny, perjury, and corruption, have clearly become the 'coins of the judicial realm' in this litigation!

d. In crystal clear and certain terms, with supporting evidence, Sassower has accused Referee Donald Diamond of fixing, corruption, pay-offs, and similar criminal activities over the past two years, and it takes a remarkably vivid and base imagination to conceive that he should be designated as the judicial officer to hear a criminal contempt proceeding!"

d. I really do not accept the statement that I, was the only one who lost, if in fact, I did lose, on such appeal.

e. I knew beforehand, that the appeal had been "fixed" in the Appellate Division (see "legal poll-legal quiz"), and desired to "pull the dragon from his cave, into the broad daylight!

Respectfully,


GEORGE SASSOWER, Esq.
51 Davis Avenue,
White Plains, New York, 10605
914-949-2169

cc: Gerald Stern, Esq.
Commission on Judicial Conduct

Michael A. Gentile, Esq.
Disciplinary Committee, First Dept.

Associate Justice Isaac Rubin
Associate Justice Bentley Kassal
Associate Justice Theodore R. Kupferman
Associate Justice Arnold L. Fein
Hon. Martin Evans

Feltman, Karesh, Major & Farbman, Esqs.
Kreindler & Relkin, P.C.
Senior Attorney, David S. Cook, Esq.
Sam Polur, Esq.